

CUP 21 9.29/18

ANSWERS to the *Objections* which were brought against the *ROCHDALE Canal-Bill*, on its third Reading in the *House of Commons*.

OBJECTION 1. *That a broad Canal would best serve the Public, with Locks 15 feet wide.*

ANSWER. The Public would NOT be best served with Locks 15 feet wide, because the principal Traffic of the *Rochdale Canal* would be with the Midland and Western Counties of *England*, by way of the *Staffordshire Canal*, which has only seven feet locks; and must unavoidably pass through *Hare-Castle Tunnel*, which will admit Boats only *seven feet* wide at the most. With seven-feet boats (such as are used on the *Staffordshire Canal*) Goods may be conveyed from *Rochdale* to *Birmingham*, *Oxford* &c. and also to *London* by the *Braunston Canal*, WITHOUT TRANSHIPPING: which could not possibly be done with fifteen-feet locks, without very great waste of water, or frequent delays by waiting for two boats to pass at the same time.

2. *That a Toll of 14d. per Ton was to be paid to the Duke of Bridgewater on all goods passing from his Navigation into the Rochdale Canal.*

Ans. This proposed Toll would have been no more than a *fair compensation* for the expence of building a Lock and keeping it in repair, and for the Loss of the Wharfage-Money which he now RECEIVES for all goods passing from the Port of *Liverpool*, and from the Midland and Western Counties of *England*, to any place lying Eastward of *Manchester*, and *vice versa*: which goods would not be brought to his Wharfs or Warehouses at *Manchester* after the junction of these two Canals at *Cornbrook*.

He is entitled to this compensation upon the general principle, that all Canals shall compensate all persons whom they may injure. He is entitled to it specially, because he has expended 40,000£. at *Manchester* in providing Wharfs and Warehouses for the public Accommodation.

This

3. *This Toll would make him and his successors a revenue of more than 7000£. per annum.*

Ans. This is an arbitrary assumption, which cannot be proved. But it may be proved that this Toll, TOGETHER with the Tonnage under his present Act, would not amount (Wharfage and Warehouse-room included) to *three halfpence per Ton per mile* on the whole length of his Canal: which still leaves the Navigation of his Canal cheaper than that of Canals in general by 20 per Cent. and of the *Bury and Bolton* Canal by 50 per Cent. the Proprietors of that Canal having power to charge *three-pence per Ton per mile*.

4. *This is an unprecedented Clause.*

Ans. It is *not* an unprecedented clause. The Proprietors of the *Stratford* Canal pay 400£. per annum to Mr. *Parrott* as a compensation for the loss which his Navigation on the *Avon* sustained by that Canal.

The Proprietors of the *Braunston* Canal pay to the City of London 1000£. per annum by instalments, for the loss which the *Thames*-Navigation may sustain from that Canal.

The same Proprietors also secure to the *Oxford* Canal Company Tolls amounting to 10,000£. a year, as a compensation for the losses sustained by their Canal.

Many other instances might be added; but it seems unnecessary to adduce them.

5. *By the clause introduced into the Bill on the Report (which RESTRAINS the Promoters of the Rochdale Canal from cutting into the Duke's Canal without his consent) an Individual (meaning the Duke of Bridgewater) will be empowered to shut up the communication between these two Canals, as his will may dictate.*

The *Rochdale* Company and the Duke had AGREED upon a junction, and had fixed the terms of compensation.

The Committee broke that agreement by a clause compelling the junction, but rejecting the compensation.

It was the intention of certain persons thereby to detach the Duke from the Company, and to destroy the Bill by disuniting the interests of its Promoters.

The



The Company kept their faith with the Duke. And as the ORIGINAL AGREEMENT, which was the basis of the application to Parliament, was broken, the Company wished to be RESTRAINED from cutting into his Canal until a NEW agreement could be made for that purpose.

The *restraining clause*, introduced into the Bill, had NO other object. Its aim was *justice*. It looked forward to a junction of the two Canals under a future AGREEMENT, including a compensation.

But this agreement, when made, could not have *impowered the Duke to shut up the communication between these two Canals, as his will might dictate*, because it could not have had the force of a Law without the sanction of Parliament; which would have regulated the Conditions, *present and future*, on which that communication should subsist and be continued.

6. *The Clause last alluded to was smuggled into the Bill on the Report, at a time when there were only four or five Members in the House, and therefore the Bill ought to be rejected on that account.*

Ans. It was NOT smuggled into the Bill. It was introduced into it by AGREEMENT, with the *knowledge* and by the *consent* of the Adversaries of the Bill. The Persons who concerted this agreement, were the two *known* Leaders of the contending Parties in the Lower House. And printed Papers, about *four hundred* in number, stating the propriety of the Clause, and the necessity of its being introduced into the Bill on the Report, had been distributed to the Members of the House nearly two days previous to the Debate.

The Committee of the Promoters of the intended *Rochdale* Canal have thus stated the chief Objections which were urged against their proceedings on the *third* reading of their Bill. And they have subjoined to each its separate and distinct reply; which would have been given to the Public previous to the decision of the 17th, had those objections been disclosed in time for public animadversion. They trust, however, that the explanations above stated, although too late for the *safety* of their Bill, will be early enough for their own justification; and will prove that their conduct has been fair, just, candid and strictly Parliamentary.

20. April 1793.

For General Meeting of the
Subscribers is appointed to be held
at Mr. Warrington, in Rochdale, on
Thursday the 9th day of May next
to determine whether (or not) a fresh
application shall be made to
Parliament the next Session
If you cannot conveniently
attend you may vote by Proxy
with proxy being a Subscriber's
producing in Letter or other written
Authority for that purpose

Yours most Obedt^l Serv^t
Geo. Shuttleworth
Rochdale 23rd Apr. 93

Rochdale Canal.

N^o. 6.

Answers to Objections
advanced on the third
Reading of the Bill.



Henry Shuttleworth

18 DEC 11 11.11.11

Shuttleworth